

Remarks:

Claims 1-6 and 13-15 are pending in the subject application. Claims 13-15 have been cancelled. Claim 2 has been amended.

Election/Restriction:

The Examiner has indicated the previously filed claims 13-15 are directed to a method that was not previously recited. The Examiner further indicated that claims 1-6 are constructively elected and claims 13-15 are withdrawn from consideration. Accordingly, the Applicants have cancelled claims 13-15.

Drawings:

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 CFR §1.83(a) because the “alternating loads” of claim 1 must be shown. The Applicants have amended Figure 1A to show the “alternating loads” by adding the articulation points 7 and loads L1, L2, L3, L4 at the articulation points 7. Additionally, the Applicants have amended paragraph [0028] of the specification to include the reference characters L1, L2, L3, L4 of the loads at the articulation points 7 of the component 1.

This amendment is supported by paragraphs [0010], [0023], [0024], [0028] of the specification, as originally filed. Accordingly, the objection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112:

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, the Examiner states that claim 2, line 3 uses the term “with less material,” which is awkward as to what is being compared and explanation is required.

The Applicants have amended claim 2 to remove this limitation. Therefore, this rejection is overcome and should be withdrawn. For at least this reason, claim 2 is allowable.

Allowable Subject Matter:

The Examiner has indicated that claims 1 and 3-6 are allowed. The Examiner has further indicated that claim 2 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 USC

§112, second paragraph, and include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the allowable subject matter. As previously indicated, claim 2 has been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 USC §112, second paragraph by removing the reference to the term “with less material”. Accordingly, this rejection has been overcome and claim 2 is allowable for at least this reason.

Conclusion

All rejections and objections having been addressed, it is therefore respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Heino Feussahrens et al.



Lisa M. Muhleck
Reg. No. 61,710
Attorney for Applicant

Date: 3/23/09

QUINN LAW GROUP, PLLC
39555 Orchard Hill Place, Ste. 520
Novi, Michigan 48375
Phone: 248-380-9300
Fax: 248-380-8968